arXiv:1608.05160v1 [math.LO] 18 Aug 2016

Reverse mathematics of the relativised fast growing hierarchy

Florian Pelupessy

We examine the reverse mathematical status of the totality of the relativised fast growing hierarchy. We assume a suitable encoding for ordinals up to ε_0 as in e.g. [2], or alternatively as ordinal terms. When we have transfinite recursion up to ε_0 available, we define a fast growing hierarchy relative to f as follows:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} F_0^f(x) & = & f(x), \\ F_{\alpha+1}^f(x) & = & F_\alpha^{f^{(x+1)}}(1), \\ F_\gamma^f(x) & = & F_{\gamma[x]}^f(x) \text{ if } \gamma \text{ is a limit.} \end{array}$$

The status of the totality of F_ω, the relativised Ackermann function, has been determined in [1]. Unlike in that paper, we determine the status directly and for all $\alpha \leq \varepsilon_0$. Take $\omega_0 = 0$ and $\omega_{n+1} = \omega^{\omega_n}$. The main result of this note is:

Theorem 1 RCA_0 *proves that the following are equivalent for every* n*:*

1. ω_{n+1} *is well founded: every strictly descending of ordinals below* ω_{n+1} *is finite.*
2. $F_{\omega_n}^f$ *is total for every* $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$*.*

Definition

Define the following function $K : (\varepsilon_0)^* \times \mathbb{N} \to (\varepsilon_0)^* \times \mathbb{N}$. Intuitively, this function represents one step in the obvious way to attempt to compute a value for

F^f:

$$K_f(\alpha_0 \dots \alpha_n, x) = \begin{cases} (\alpha_0 \dots \alpha_{n-1}, f(x)) & \text{if } \alpha_n = 0, \\ (\alpha_0 \dots \alpha_{n-1} \overbrace{\beta \dots \beta}^{x+1 \text{ times}}, 1) & \text{if } \alpha_n = \beta + 1, \\ (\alpha_0 \dots \alpha_{n-1} \alpha_n[x], x) & \text{if } \alpha_n \text{ is a limit,} \end{cases}$$

and $K_f(\langle\rangle, x) = (\langle\rangle, x)$. Notice that $(\alpha_0 \dots \alpha_n, x)$ simply represents the term $F_{\alpha_0}(\dots(F_{\alpha_n}(x)\dots)$. F^f is the result of repeated applications of the 'computation steps' (when it exists).

Definition 1 $F^f_\alpha(x) = \mu y.\exists n K^{(n)}_f(\alpha, x) = (\langle\rangle, y)$. *We call the sequence* $\{K^{(i)}_f(\alpha, x)\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *the derivation of* $F^f_\alpha(x)$.

One can show that this definition is equivalent to usual Δ^0_1 definitions as in, e.g. [2] (adapted to take into account the different initial function and slightly different conditions).

Strength

Lemma 1 (RCA_0**)** *For* $\alpha \leq \varepsilon_0$*:* ω^α *is well founded if and only if* F^f_α *is a total function for every* $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$.

Proof: "⇒": Take $h(\alpha_0 \dots \alpha_n, x) = \omega^{\alpha_0} + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_n}$ and $h(\langle\rangle, x) = 0$. By well-foundedness the sequence $\{h(K^{(i)}_f(\alpha, x))\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ reaches zero.

Definition 2 (Maximal coefficient) $\mathrm{mc}(0) = 0$ *and, for* $\alpha = \omega^{\alpha_0} \cdot a_0 + \dots + \omega^{\alpha_n} \cdot a_n$ *with* $\alpha_0 > \dots > \alpha_n$, $a_i > 0$*:*

$$\mathrm{mc}(\alpha) = \max\{\mathrm{mc}(\alpha_i), a_i\}.$$

"⇐": Given infinite sequence $\omega^\alpha = \alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots$, take $f(x) > \mathrm{mc}(\alpha_{x+1}) + x + 1$ and strictly increasing. We show that this implies that for every $i > 0$ we have $h(K^{(i)}_f(\alpha, f(0))) > \alpha_i$, in contradiction with the totality of F^f_α.

First, notice:

1. By Π^0_1-induction on d: if $\omega_d > \gamma > \beta$ and γ is a limit, then $\gamma[\mathrm{mc}(\beta) + 1] > \beta$.

2. $F^f_\beta(y) \geq f(y)$, hence $F^{f\,(y)}_{\beta}(1) > y$ for all $\beta \leq \alpha$, y which occur in the derivation of $F^f_\alpha(f(0))$.

3. if n is the smallest such that $K^{(n)}_f(\beta, y) = (\langle\rangle, z)$, then $K^{(n)}_f(\sigma\beta, y) = (\sigma, z)$.

Notation: $K^{(i)}_j = (K^{(i)}_f(\alpha, f(0)))_j$ and $K^{(i)} = K^{(i)}_f(\alpha, f(0))$.

Take $a_0 = 0$ and $a_{i+1} = a_i + 1$ if $K^{(a_i)}_0$ ends with a zero, otherwise as follows:

Let $b \geq a_i$ be the smallest such that $K^{(b)}_0$ ends with a successor $\beta + 1$, take:

$$a_{i+1} = \min b + n + 1 \text{ such that } K^{(n)}_f(\overbrace{\beta \dots \beta}^{i+1}, 1) = (\langle\rangle, z).$$

Claim: For every i we have:

$$h(K^{(a_i)}) > \alpha_{i+1}$$

and

$$K^{(a_i)}_1 \geq f(i).$$

Proof of the claim: Induction on i, if $i = 0$ the claim follows directly. For the induction step, assume that the claim is true for a_i.

Case 1) $a_{i+1} = a_i + 1$: The inequalities follow directly from the definition of K:

$$h(K^{(a_{i+1})}) = h(K^{(a_i)}) - 1 \geq \alpha_{i+1} > \alpha_{i+2}$$

and

$$K^{(a_{i+1})}_1 = f(K^{(a_i)}_1) \geq f(f(i)) \geq f(i+1).$$

Case 2) Let b and β be those from the definition of a_{i+1}. $K^{(j)}_0$ ends with a limit for $j \in [a_i, b)$ (if $b > a_i$), hence, by induction hypothesis and notice (1), $h(K^{(b)}) > \alpha_{i+1}$ and $K^{(b)}_1 \geq f(i)$.

$K^{(b)}_0$ is of the form $\gamma_0 \dots \gamma_l \beta + 1$. Therefore, $K^{(b+1)}_0$ has the form:

$$\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_l \overbrace{\beta \dots \beta}^{\geq \mathrm{mc}(\alpha_{i+1})+1} \overbrace{\beta \dots \beta}^{i+1},$$

so $h(K^{(a_{i+1})}) \geq h(K^{(b)})[\mathrm{mc}(\alpha_{i+1}) + 1] > \alpha_{i+1} > \alpha_{i+2}$ by notice (1) and (3).

By notice (2) and (3), $K^{(a_{i+1})}_1 \geq F^{f\,(i+1)}_{\beta}(1) \geq f(i+1)$.

This ends the proof of the claim, hence the lemma.

□

References

[1] A. Kreuzer and K. Yokoyama, *On principles between Σ_1- and Σ_2-induction and monotone enumerations*.

[2] P. Hájek and P. Pudlák, *Metamathematics of First-order Arithmetic*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, vol. 3, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[3] S. Simpson, *Subsystems of second order arithmetic*.